

All-optical controlled phase gate in quantum dot molecules via adiabatic passage and hole tunneling

Li-Bo Chen^{1*} and Wen Yang^{2†}

¹*School of Science, Qingdao Technological University, Qingdao 266033, China and*

²*Beijing Computational Science Research Center, No.3 Heqing Road Haidian District Beijing 100084, China*

(Dated: February 27, 2014)

We propose a two-qubit optically controlled phase gate in quantum dot molecules via adiabatic passage and hole tunneling. Our proposal combines the merits of the current generation of vertically stacked self-assembled InAs quantum dots and adiabatic passage. The simulation shows an implementation of the gate with a fidelity exceeding 0.98.

PACS numbers: 78.67.Hc, 03.67.Lx

I. INTRODUCTION

The spin of an electron, trapped in a self-assembled semiconductor quantum dot (SAQD) and manipulated by laser pulses, is believed to be a promising qubit candidate for quantum computation and quantum communication. Such qubits take the advantage of both long coherence time¹⁻³ and high speed for optical coherent control^{4,5}. Recently, there have been many experimental demonstrations of the key DiVincenzo requirements⁶ for such qubit, for examples, spin initialization⁷⁻⁹, the coherent manipulation of electron spins^{4,10,11}, and fast spin nondestructive measurement¹².

Entangling gates for two qubits form an essential ingredient of quantum computation. Significant effort has been invested in theoretical protocols for two qubit gate¹³⁻²¹ and experimental demonstration of optical entanglement control²² between QDs. However there has been no reported experimental realization of optically controlled phase gate between QDs. In this paper, we propose a two-qubit controlled phase gate in a vertical self-assembled quantum dot molecule (SAQDM)^{23,24} utilizing adiabatic passage and hole tunneling. Compared with our previous scheme²⁰, the using of adiabatic passage efficiently suppressing spontaneous decay from excited states²⁵⁻²⁸ and need not precisely timing the interval between the two pulses. Our proposal bases on the current generation of SAQDMs, and the simulation shows the gate can implemented with a fidelity exceeding 0.98.

II. THE BASIC MODEL

Our model is based on the vertically coupled SAQDs of Ref 23,24 (see Fig. 1). The electrons or holes can tunnel between the two dots to create a quantum dot molecule (QDM). For the QDMs discussed here, the nominal height of dot 1, h_1 , is greater than that of dot 2, h_2 , so that dot 1 exhibits the lower transition energy. This allows the hole levels to be brought into resonance with a positive electric field applied along the x axis (the growth direction), while the electron level of dot 2 is shifted to a much higher energy than that of dot 1. We use the spin of the electrons in each dot as the qubits. In the Faraday geometry, the energy levels for the single QD system in the presence of a small magnetic field B_z along the z axis (growth direction)^{9,29}. The two eigenstate states of electron spin, i.e.

$|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$, are split by the magnetic field B_z . The lowest-energy interband transition is to the trion state $|\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ ($|\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$), consisting of two electrons in a singlet state and a heavy hole. Optical selection dictate that the σ^- (σ^+) polarization laser could coupled the transition $|\downarrow\rangle \rightarrow |\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ ($|\uparrow\rangle \rightarrow |\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$), and other transitions are forbidden.

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF TWO QUBITS PHASE GATE

The ideal phase gate aims to impose a phase change on the state $|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle$ without affecting the phase of the other three states. It should also preserve phase coherence for a superposition of the four QD spin states. This operation can be characterized by the unitary transformation:

$$\begin{aligned} |\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle &\rightarrow |\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle, & |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle &\rightarrow -|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle \\ |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle &\rightarrow |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle, & |\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle &\rightarrow |\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

We use the convention that the vertical arrows on the left and right of the comma sign are, respectively, the directions of the spins in dot 1 and dot 2.

Fig. 2 shows the the level diagram of the two quantum dot and gate operation process, which includes three sequential steps:

Firstly, the QDM is illuminated with a σ^- circularly polarized continuous wave (CW) laser pulse $\Omega_1(t)$ propagating in the x direction (growth direction). The laser is tuned such that it could create an exciton in the quantum dot 1 (only if it is state is $|\downarrow\rangle$) without affecting the quantum dot 2. The Hamiltonian for the QDM under this laser excitation is

$$H_1 = \Omega_1(t) |\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow, \downarrow(\uparrow)\rangle \langle \downarrow, \downarrow(\uparrow)| + \tau |\downarrow\uparrow, \downarrow\downarrow(\uparrow)\rangle \langle \downarrow\uparrow\downarrow, \downarrow(\uparrow)| + H.c., \quad (2)$$

where we assume $\hbar = 1$, and τ is the hole tunneling rate between the two dots. The Hamiltonian has a dark state

$$|D\rangle \propto \tau |\downarrow, \downarrow(\uparrow)\rangle - \Omega_1(t) |\downarrow\uparrow, \downarrow\downarrow(\uparrow)\rangle. \quad (3)$$

If we turn on the σ^- circularly polarized laser pulse and increase the $\Omega_1(t)$ slowly, when $\Omega_1(t) \gg \tau$ the state $|\downarrow, \downarrow(\uparrow)\rangle$ will be adiabatically transferred to the state $|\downarrow\uparrow, \downarrow\downarrow(\uparrow)\rangle$ almost without exciting the media state $|\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow, \downarrow(\uparrow)\rangle$. In this process, the states $|\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle$ and $|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle$ are not affected by the laser pulse.

Secondly, we apply another σ^- circularly polarized pulse Ω_2 to coupled the state $|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle$ to the state $|\uparrow, \downarrow\downarrow\rangle$. The Hamiltonian for the QDM under this laser excitation is

$$H_2 = \Omega_2(t) |\uparrow, \downarrow\downarrow\rangle \langle \uparrow, \downarrow| + \tau |\uparrow\downarrow, \downarrow\uparrow\rangle \langle \uparrow, \downarrow\downarrow| + H.c.. \quad (4)$$

Starting with the initial state $|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle$ the system evolves at the time t to

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(t)\rangle = & \frac{1}{\tau^2 + \Omega_2^2} (\tau^2 + \Omega_2^2 \cos(t\sqrt{\tau^2 + \Omega_2^2}) |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle \\ & - i\Omega_2 \sqrt{\tau^2 + \Omega_2^2} \sin(t\sqrt{\tau^2 + \Omega_2^2}) |\uparrow, \downarrow\downarrow\rangle \\ & + (\tau\Omega_2 \cos(t\sqrt{\tau^2 + \Omega_2^2}) - \tau\Omega_2) |\uparrow\downarrow, \downarrow\uparrow\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

At $t_1 \sqrt{\tau^2 + \Omega_2^2} = \pi$, $|\psi(t_1)\rangle = \frac{\tau^2 - \Omega_2^2}{\tau^2 + \Omega_2^2} |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle - \frac{2\tau\Omega_2}{\tau^2 + \Omega_2^2} |\uparrow\downarrow, \downarrow\uparrow\rangle$. In the case $\Omega_2 \gg \tau$, $t_1 \approx \pi/\Omega_2$, $|\psi(t_1)\rangle \approx -|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle$. The state $|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle$ acquiring a π phase, the transition $|\downarrow\uparrow, \downarrow\downarrow\rangle \rightarrow |\downarrow\uparrow, \downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ is blocked because of the Pauli exclusion principle.

Finally we slowly turn off the first CW laser Ω_1 so that the state $|\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow, \downarrow(\uparrow)\rangle$ can adiabatically transfer back to the state $|\downarrow, \downarrow(\uparrow)\rangle$. The system returns to its original state and only the state $|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle$ acquires the -1 factor, i.e., controlled phase gate.

IV. SIMULATION AND CONCLUSION

To simulate the system's dynamics, we employ master equation of density matrix ρ ³⁰

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -i[H_1 + H_2, \rho] + L(\rho), \quad (6)$$

the superoperator L is given by

$$L(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 (2L_i \rho L_i^\dagger - L_i^\dagger L_i \rho - \rho L_i^\dagger L_i), \quad (7)$$

where $L_i = \sqrt{\gamma_i} c_i$ describes spontaneous photon decay in QD i .

We choose the pulses as $\Omega_1 = \frac{5\sqrt{\pi}}{2t_0} \exp[-(0.05t)^2/t_0^2]$, $\Omega_2 = \frac{2\sqrt{\pi}}{t_0} \exp[-(2t)^2/t_0^2]$, with $t_0 = 1$ ps, $1/\tau = \hbar/(2 \text{ meV}) = 2.07$ ps, and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1 \text{ ns}^{-1}$. The dynamics of matrix elements $\rho_{|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle \langle \uparrow, \downarrow|}^{00}$, $\rho_{|\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle \langle \downarrow, \uparrow|}^{00}$, and $\rho_{|\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow, \downarrow|}^{00}$, are shown in Fig. 3, $\rho_{|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle \langle \uparrow, \downarrow|}^{00}$ doesn't change in this process. It shows that the time of implement the phase gate is $T_g \approx 100$ ps, if initial state $|\Psi^0\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|\uparrow, \uparrow\rangle + |\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow, \downarrow\rangle)$, we calculate the fidelity of the phase gate $F = 0.98$. The fidelity can be improved further if the lifetime of the state $|\downarrow\uparrow, \downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ is increased. Consider this system in a cavity, the state $|\downarrow\uparrow, \downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ will be off resonant with their cavity modes, γ_2 can be reduced to $(8 \text{ ns})^{-1}$ ³¹, the fidelity can be as high as 0.998.

In conclusion, we have proposed an all-optical controlled phase gate which benefits from current generation of QDM and adiabatic passage. Our simulation shows the fidelity of the phase gate is exceeding 0.98 by using realistic values for all parameters.

Acknowledgments: We thanks Prof. L. J. Sham for helpful discussions. This research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.11304174), Natural Science Foundation of Shandong Province (Grant No. ZR2013AQ010), and the research starting foundation of Qingdao.

* Electronic address: clb8109@gmail.com

† Electronic address: wenyang@csrc.ac.cn

¹ D. Birkedal, K. Leosson, and J. M. Hvam, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 227401 (2001).

² P. Borri, W. Langbein, S. Schneider, U. Woggon, R. L. Sellin, D. Ouyang, and D. Bimberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 157401 (2001).

³ X. Xu, W. Yao, B. Sun, D. G. Steel, A. S. Bracker, D. Gammon, and L. J. Sham, Nature (London) 459, 1105 (2009).

⁴ D. Press, T. D. Ladd, B. Zhang, and Y. Yamamoto, Nature (London) 456, 218 (2008).

⁵ E. D. Kim, K. Truex, X. Xu, B. Sun, D. G. Steel, A. S. Bracker, D. Gammon, and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 167401 (2010).

⁶ D. P. DiVincenzo, Fortschr. Phys. 48, 771 (2000).

⁷ M. Atature, J. Dreiser, A. Badolato, A. Hoge, K. Karrai, and A. Imamoglu, Science 312, 551 (2006).

⁸ C. Emary, X. Xu, D. G. Steel, S. Saikin, and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 047401 (2007).

⁹ X. Xu, Y. Wu, B. Sun, Q. Huang, J. Cheng, D. G. Steel, A. S. Bracker, D. Gammon, C. Emary, and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. Lett.

99, 097401 (2007).

¹⁰ E. D. Kim, K. Truex, X. Xu, B. Sun, D. G. Steel, A. S. Bracker, D. Gammon, and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 167401 (2010).

¹¹ A. Gamouras, R. Mathew, and K. C. Hall, J. Appl. Phys. 112, 014313 (2012).

¹² D. Kim, S. E. Economou, S. C. Badescu, M. Scheibner, A. S. Bracker, M. Bashkansky, T. L. Reinecke, and D. Gammon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 101, 236804 (2008).

¹³ C. Piermarocchi, P. Chen, L. J. Sham, and D. G. Steel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 167402 (2002).

¹⁴ T. Calarco, A. Datta, P. Fedichev, E. Pazy, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. A 68, 012310 (2003).

¹⁵ A. Nazir, B. W. Lovett, S. D. Barrett, T. P. Spiller, and G. A. D. Briggs, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 150502 (2004).

¹⁶ E. M. Gauger, A. Nazir, S. C. Benjamin, T. M. Stace, and B. W. Lovett, New J. Phys. 10, 073016 (2008).

¹⁷ C. Emary and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. B 75, 125317 (2007).

¹⁸ K. J. Xu, Y. P. Huang, M. G. Moore, and C. Piermarocchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103, 037401 (2009).

- ¹⁹ S. Puri, N. Y. Kim, Y. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. B 85, 241403(R) (2012).
- ²⁰ L. B. Chen, L. J. Sham, E. Waks, Phys. Rev. B 85, 115319 (2012).
- ²¹ S. E. Economou, J. I. Climente, A. Badolato, A. S. Bracker, D. Gammon, and M. F. Doty, Phys. Rev. B 86, 085319 (2012).
- ²² D. Kim, S. Carter, A. Greulich, A. Bracker, and D. Gammon, Nature Phys. 7, 223 (2011).
- ²³ M. Scheibner, M. F. Doty, I. V. Ponomarev, A. S. Bracker, E. A. Stinaff, V. L. Korenev, T. L. Reinecke, and D. Gammon, Phys. Rev. B 75, 245318 (2007).
- ²⁴ M. F. Doty, J. I. Climente, A. Greulich, M. Yakes, A. S. Bracker, and D. Gammon, Phys. Rev. B 81, 035308 (2010).
- ²⁵ J.R. Kuklinski, U. Gaubatz, F.T. Hioe and K. Bergmann, Phys. Rev. A 40, R6741 (1989).
- ²⁶ U. Gaubatz, P. Rudecki, S. Schiemann, K. Bergmann, J. Chem. Phys. 92, 5363 (1990).
- ²⁷ K. Bergmann, H. Theuer, and B. W. Shore, Rev. Mod. Phys. 70, 1003 (1998).
- ²⁸ S. K. Saikin, C. Emary, D. G. Steel, and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. B 78, 235314 (2008).
- ²⁹ J. Berezovsky, M. H. Mikkelsen, N. G. Stoltz, L. A. Coldren, and D. D. Awschalom, Science 320, 349 (2008).
- ³⁰ D. F. Walls and G. J. Milburn, Quantum Optics (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994).
- ³¹ K. Hennessy, A. Badolato, M. Winger, D. Gerace, M. Atatüre, S. Gulde, S. Fält, E. L. Hu, and A. Imamoglu, Nature (London) 445, 896 (2007).




FIG. 1: [Color online] Schematic of the vertically coupled quantum dot system. The height of the dot 1 is h_1 , that of dot 2 is h_2 , the inter-dot barrier is d . A positive electric field along the z axis is applied to bring the hole levels into resonance.




FIG. 2: [Color online] The energy diagram of the two Quantum dot ground states and the optically allowed transitions to the trion states. The large X indicates that the Ω_2 pulse does not affect this transition while performing a 2π rotation between $|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle$ and $|\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle$.




FIG. 3: [Color online] Dynamical evolution of several density matrix elements during the gate operation via numerical simulation. The top figure shows the pulse intensity of Ω_1 and Ω_2 . The bottom figure shows the time evolution of three density matrix elements during the controlled phase gate operation, in which the solid (blue) line, the dot (red) line, and the dash (green) line denote density matrix elements $\rho_{|\downarrow,\uparrow\rangle\times|\downarrow,\uparrow\rangle}^{00}$, $\rho_{|\downarrow,\downarrow\rangle\times|\downarrow,\downarrow\rangle}^{00}$, and $\rho_{|\uparrow,\downarrow\rangle\times|\uparrow,\downarrow\rangle}^{00}$ doesn't change in this process.